UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,926	10/13/2004	Suzanne Berlin	03292.102030.	5925

66569   7590   10/27/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX)
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 May 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>28-47</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>28-47</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final action is in response to the RCE filed on: 05/26/09. Additionally,

this non-final action is a re-issue of the non-final action sent on: 08/05/09; since the

action sent on 08/05/09 was mistakenly sent out prior to the suspension of action term

(3 months) being completed.

2.   Claims 1-27 are cancelled. Claims 28-47 are pending.

3.   Claims 28-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Aggarwal et al, in view of Sheshadri, and further in view of Baker et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

        The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 28-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Aggarwal et al (US Patent: 6,917,969, issued: Jul. 12, 2005, filed: Jan. 3, 2002), in

view of Sheshadri ("Understanding JavaServer Pges Model 2 architecture", December

1999, Pages 1-14), and further in view of Baker et al (US Application: 2004/0039990

A1, published: Feb. 26, 2004, filed: Mar. 28, 2003).

With regards to claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches:

Receiving a request for a web page (column 4, lines 32-41: whereas a request for web page content is received by a web server)

A first file corresponding to the webpage (column 4, lines 41-45: whereas a servlet file is retrieved/implemented)

Obtaining an XML tag from the first file, wherein the XML tag includes an element *name* to be formatted (column 4, lines 41-67, and column 5, lines 1-5: whereas an XML tag (which corresponds to an element) is obtained/parsed from using the first file via a request to a second file (XML/markup file))

Using the XML tag to obtain a formatting instruction corresponding to the element *name* from *a second file* (column 4, lines 41-67, and column 5, lines 1-5: the XML tag (which corresponds to an element) data from a second file is used to obtain formatting /rendering instructions via mapping, such that an appropriate bean class file is retrieved)

Formatting program code corresponding to an interface element specified in the formatting instruction, the data according to the formatting instruction (column 4, lines 41-67: whereas the data is formatted according to the formatting code/instruction (bean selection and execution))

*Generating a third file including the program code corresponding to the to the interface element; Transmitting the third file using a communications network (*column 5, lines 45-50: whereas a third file such as HTML or JavaScript is generated and transmitted along with rendered interface data/content elements*)*

Although Aggarwal et al teaches a first file (servlet file) and an interface element, Aggarwal et al does not expressly mention that the first servlet file is *received,* the XML tag includes a field name, using the XML tag to obtain from a second file a formatting instruction corresponding to the *field name,* program code corresponding to an *input interface element … wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.*

Yet, Sheshadri teaches the first file (servlet file), *is received* (page 8: whereas, the request from a client includes the name of the servlet file to be retrieved as indicated by the EShop.jsp string)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Aggarwal et al's request processing method, such that a first file is specified to be received from a request, as similarly taught by Sheshadri. The combination would have allowed Aggarwal et al to have "processed actions … by the controller servlet" (Sheshadri, page 7).

However, although the combination of Aggarwal et al and Sheshadri teach a centralized element rendering facility, as similarly explained above, the combination do not expressly teach the XML tag includes a *field name,* using the XML tag to obtain from a second file a formatting instruction corresponding to the *field name,* program code corresponding to an *input* interface element … *wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element.*

Yet, Baker et al teaches the XML tag includes a field name, using the XML tag to obtain from a second file, a formatting instruction corresponding to the *field name,* program code corresponding to an *input* interface element … *wherein the program code is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input interface element* (paragraph 0064, 0091: whereas, an XML tag includes a form field name, and the XML tag is used to obtain a formatting instruction from a XSL file, such that a field name is enabled for input in a third output file)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the combination of Aggarwal et al and Sheshadri's centralized element rendering facility, such that the elements can be input interface elements, as similarly taught by Baker et al. The combination would have allowed Aggarwal et al to have implemented an easier way to modify and create forms with respect to changing circumstances or desires (Baker et al, paragraph 0003).

With regards to claim 29, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *wherein the formatting instruction is obtained from a centralized server storing the second file* (column 4, lines 30-40: whereas a server computer on a network location stores the requested content (requested content located in second file on a network location)).

With regards to claim 30, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *wherein the formatting instruction includes a class file name*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 31, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *further comprising compiling the first file into a servlet*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28 (since the first file is a servlet), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 32, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *determining if the first file includes the request for data; generating a database query, if the first file includes the request for data; and extracting the requested data from a database, if the first file includes the request for data*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28 (since the servlet file retrieves data content, by generating a query for the appropriate content file/second-file from a database), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 33, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *the first file*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Aggarwal et al does not expressly teach *determining if the* first file *includes a request to store data; and storing the data in a database, if the first file includes the request to store data.*

Yet, Sheshadri teaches *determining if the* first file *includes a request to store data; and storing the data in a database, if the first file includes the request to store data* (page 8: whereas a request to add CD data is determined, and appropriately stored).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Aggarwal et al's central field rendering system, such that the first file would have included logic to determine a request for storing data, as similarly taught by Sheshadri. The combination of Aggarwal et al, Sheshadri, and Carroll, JR would have allowed Aggarwal et al to have "processed the request parameters for the item to be added" (Sheshadri, page 9).

With regards to claim 34, which depends on claim 28, the combination of Aggarwal et al and Sheshadri teaches wherein the *input interface element is one of*: a button, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 35, which depends on claim 28, the combination of Aggarwal et al and Sheshadri teaches *wherein the first file is a Java Server Page file,* as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 28, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 36, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *wherein*

the second file is formatted according to a Document Type Definition (DTD) format or an

XML Style Sheet format (column 5, lines 49-54).

With regards to claim 37, which depends on claim 28, Aggarwal et al teaches *wherein*

the third file is formatted according to a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) format:

(column 4, lines 35-40: whereas HTTP format is used as a file transfer mode of

choice/option)

With regards to claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the

method performed by the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 39, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing

a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 29, is rejected under

similar rationale.

With regards to claim 40, which depends on claim 38, for a system performing a method

similar to the method performed by the method of claim 30, is rejected under similar

rationale.

With regards to claim 41, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 31, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 42, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 32, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 43, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 33, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 44, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 34, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 45, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 35, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 46, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 36, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 47, which depends on claim 38, for a computer system performing a method similar to the method performed by the method of claim 37, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   The last remarks/arguments filed 02/23/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6.   The applicant first argues that there is no mention of XML tags in Baker et al. However, as clearly shown/known in the art, an XML document contains XML markup/code/tags. This is further evidenced in the first reference with respect to Aggarwal, which explains that an XML file is a file that is short for extensible markup language (Aggarwal, column 1, lines 20-22). In other words, an XML file includes extensibile markup tags/code.

This is further explained by Aggarwal, in column 2, lines 55-60: whereas, an XML file includes known to include markup tags.

Thus, since Baker et al implements an XML file, and the XML file further includes code

(Baker et al, paragraph 0062), then Baker et al's XML file implements tags/code, as

well; and therefore, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

7.   The applicant secondly argues that the fields mentioned in Baker are not

understood to be included in an XML TAG. However, this argument is not persuasive

since the fields mentioned in Baker can be exported as XML tags/code, and the

Examiner further explains that the export function retrieves form data in order to

generate XML Tags/code (paragraph 0064: whereas, the exports engine retrieves form

templates to render XML code/tags). The examiner respectfully points out in Baker et al

that the form data is stored as XML templates, each XML template contains specific

field information (paragraph 0062: whereas, form/field-data is stored in XML templates).

Furthermore, the XML form data is further used to generate programming code (such as

web page code), in order to display the input fields (paragraph 0062: whereas, a form

engine renders XML code, using a style sheet datafile (formatting instructions), such

that the input fields can be displayed in a browser, when the browser accepts the

rendered code), and the displayed forms include fields that allow for user input

(paragraph 0059: whereas, the displayed forms can be used for accepting feedback).

Therefore, the fields in Baker are included in XML code/tags, and the code can be

rendered using a style sheet to display input fields.

8.   The applicant makes a third argument that Baker makes no mention of "an input

interface elment" or " a formatting instruction", much less "an interface element specified

in a formatting instruction".

However, this argument is not persuasive, since as explained above, the form data is

stored in XML code/tags, and the form includes fields, which are rendered, such that

end users can input feedback data into the rendered forms.

9.   The applicant makes a fourth argument that nothing has been found in Baker et

al (in the cited portions or in the document as a whole) that is believed to teach or

suggest "using the XML tag to obtain, from a second file, a formatting instruction

corresponding to the field name" and "formatting program code corresponding to an

input interface element specified in the formatting instruction, wherein the program code

is configured to enable a value corresponding to the field name to be input via the input

interface element". However, as this argument is not persuasive, and the examiner

respectfully directs the applicant's attention to the explanation above, for how the

teachings are taught, in the combination of Aggarwal et al, Sehsadri, and Baker et al.

Conclusion

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to WILSON TSUI whose telephone number is (571)272-

7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

/Wilson Tsui/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
October 14, 2009